

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/020,628	12/14/2001	Timothy Calvin Visser	Smiths P177US 9214		
7:	590 08/25/2005	EXAMINER			
VARNUM, R	IDDERING, SCHMII	CHARIOUI, MOHAMED			
P.O. BOX 352					
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2857	:	
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/020,62	28	VISSER ET AL.	\Q(\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma}})			
		Examine	r	Art Unit				
		Mohamed	Charioui	2857				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with	the correspondence addr	ess			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THE PROVISION OF THE PROVI	DN. R 1.136(a). In no evo n. a reply within the stat briod will apply and w latute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply utory minimum of thirty (3 ill expire SIX (6) MONTH dication to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this comr IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status								
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	2 June 2005.						
·	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)[☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		noidoration.					
· —	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
· —	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election r	equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b)	objected to by	the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) t	pe held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con	rrection is requir	ed if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. No	ote the attached C	Office Action or form PTO	-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the	nents have bee nents have bee priority docume	en received. en received in App ents have been re	olication No	age			
* ;	application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a	•	· · · ·	ceived.				
	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	.		nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB		5) Notice of Info	rmal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)			
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date		6)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Laing et al. (U.S. 5,399,975).

Laing et al. teach applying a voltage signal of a predefined level to the external connecting pin (see col. 2, line 57 to col. 3, line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabele et al. (U.S. 5,991,521) in view of Laing et al. (U.S. 5,399,975).

As per claims 1 and 2, Gabele et al. teach using an integrated circuit programming device, executing a device read command (see col. 4, lines 4-45); obtaining an error message from the programming device identifying certain of the connecting pins appearing to be disconnected from a memory circuit element (see col. 4, lines 22-30).

Gabele et al. fails to teach connecting a voltage to said certain of said connecting pins appearing to be disconnected from the memory circuit element and applying a voltage signal to the certain of the connecting pins for a predetermined period of time.

Laing et al. teach this feature (see col. 2, line 57 to col. 3, line 25 and col. 4, lines 25-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Laing et al.'s teaching into Gabele et al.'s invention, because a voltage signal would be applied to the pins that are detected to have faulty connection. Therefore, current would flow through the pins to power up the elements connected by the pins to the rest of the circuit.

As per claims 3-6, Gabele et al. teach the system as stated above except that the step of applying comprises applying the signal to the certain connecting pins through a resistor.

Laing et al. teach this feature (see col. 2, line 57 to col. 3, line 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Laing et al.'s teaching into Gabele et al.'s invention, because the voltage would be applied to the pin through a resistor that would limit the current flowing through the pins. Therefore, system would not experience excess of current flow that might cause damage in the system.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Application/Control Number: 10/020,628

Art Unit: 2857

Applicant argues that Laing et al. patent do not teach restoring faulty elements by applying voltage to a voltage of a predefined level to the external connecting pin.

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant argument, Laing et al. teach applying voltage of a predefined level to pins (see col. 2, line 57 to col. 3, line 25 and col. 4, lines 25-32).

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Charioui whose telephone number is (571) 272-2213. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, from 9 am to 6 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/020,628

Art Unit: 2857

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (571) 272-2216. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohamed Charioui

8/10/05

MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Page 5